2: Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EE1 Bulgaria EE1

gave lectures at intervals during the year and consulted with some farmers regarding their work, he could not initiate and carry through a thorough program without the help of a local *agronom.*

As far as livestock was concerned, there were two boars and one village bull for breeding purposes. The law required that each *Obshtina* take charge of its own breeding animals. There was supposed to be a local breeding association, but the mayor was the only member. A fund was being collected for a village barn. Meanwhile, the animals were boarded out to various peasants who received a fixed sum. Improvement of livestock was more easily managed through the control of male animals, which were inspected each spring. Those of bad quality were castrated (the veterinary's fees for this work being the following: pig, 10 leva; donkey, 20 leva; horse, 40 leva). If the animal died, the State paid for the loss. I happened to visit the village at the time the veterinary doctor was making his inspection of horses. Before he could begin his thorough examination, the representative of the *Obshtina* looked over the bills of sale to be sure each man had his own horses. This bill of sale cost 3 per cent of the amount exchanged. If the horses had been foaled at the home of the present owners, the men presented certificates of ownership which they had previously obtained from the mayor for fifteen leva. If the doctor found that a horse was ill, a second examination was made two weeks later. If the animal was still sick, State officials bought the horse for a small sum and killed it. A fine ranging from two hundred to five hundred leva was charged if the horses were not brought for the examination. While a national program for home demonstration work had been prepared, Dragalevtsy so far had received few benefits.

Recreation, like economic life, had been subjected to efforts at organization. The people of Dragalevtsy customarily associated liquor with holidays and leisure time. In the earlier days there was little organized opposition to the use of alcohol, but by 1922 considerable public opinion had been aroused against the *kruchmi.* On January 1, 1922, all the taverns of the village were closed by order of the Village Council, which thought that the drink shops were a social evil. The village was very much stirred up, most of the men siding with the tavern keepers and the women with the Village Council. The tavern

2:Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EE1 Bulgaria EE1

273
●733

keepers immediately petitioned the higher court in Sofia, which reversed the decision of the Village Council on the grounds that the order had been issued illegally, without having a vote of all the people. On March 12 the taverns opened again. A large sum of money was due the tavern keepers in the way of damages, but they did not try to collect for fear a referendum would be carried out and the taverns abolished indefinitely. Between January 1 and March 12 the men of Dragalevtsy had gone to Sofia and to other villages so frequently to drink that they had lost much time from work, to the distress of their families. Since Dragalevtsy became a resort place, it has had summer guests who demanded alcoholic beverages; this clientele aids the tavern keepers, although many peasants are still in favor of closing their places of business.

In 1935, largely at the suggestion of one of the schoolteachers, a temperance society was organized among the young men. The score of members took their organization seriously, though many villagers ridiculed it. This organization gave a *vecherinka* at which a "drunk" comedy was presented in order to discourage drinking. The temperance pledge included not only drinking but smoking and was so difficult to keep that a year later some of the members had fallen from grace. The village registrar, who was active in the Village Council in 1922 when the taverns were closed, was not permitted in the temperance association because he smoked. His admission would have greatly strengthened the work of the organization as far as alcoholic temperance was concerned.

The monthly dues were five leva, which were to be spent for buying temperance literature and sometimes in helping the poor. One member was sent to the city of Stara Zagora for a conference of all temperance associations in Bulgaria. The priest could not be a member "because he has to drink in his work," that is, communion. The organization was almost extinct because the initial enthusiasm had waned and some of the original members had dropped out. In order to justify their own actions those who quit talked against the remaining members and accused them of smoking and drinking on the side. The society's value as an aid to temperance would have been hard to estimate. While it must have had some effect on the minds of the

2: Sanders E-5 (no date) 1949 EE1 Bulgaria EE1

young people connected with it, it had little reforming influence upon the older people. The government was trying to control the sale of liquor by limiting hours of sale and by excluding minors from taverns. For example, the taverns were closed during the time of Sunday morning service.

Here, then, we have three efforts on the part of villagers and authorities to promote abstinence or temperance. The first, in 1922, used the local governmental machinery but lacked the support of the men who were the only ones with the right to vote. The second was the voluntary association of strong-willed youths, who soon found that formal organizations had short lives in Dragalevtsy. The other method consisted of the mayor's arbitrary edicts, which he had power to make people obey. From time to time he overlooked infringements of his rules, being more interested in avoiding excessive drunkenness on the part of well-known sots than in decreasing the tavern keeper's revenues.

The chief objections raised to the use of liquor were economic rather than moral. Although recreation was not commercialized in our sense of the term, the tavern keepers did make an adequate income from catering to patrons with free time on their hands.

The only formally organized recreational group in the village was the *Yunak* organization. It began its career in the village in 1932. The local group was one of hundreds scattered throughout the whole of Bulgaria for the purpose of organizing the youth for sport and physical education. The activity of this organization was intense in the beginning. Since then, however, interest died down to the point that the young men gathered only two or three times a year for exercise in the schoolyard where there were rings and a horizontal bar, and once a year for election of officers. Many of the members felt that it was an honor to belong because it signified to the rest of the villagers that "you want to be healthy." The older people, however, thought that such an organization was unnecessary since, in their opinion, "if the young people did enough work in the fields and around the stables they would not need any organization for exercise." As is the case with many clubs of this sort, there were four or five people who really carried the load in an effort to keep the group alive. Because this organization was so utterly out of line with the familistic point